

**From:** Rudy Stefenel  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/25/02 11:22pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

To: U.S. Department of Justice

From: Rudy Stefenel  
3138 Drywood Lane  
San Jose, CA 95132  
408-263-5332

1/25/02

It is essential that you incorporate the solution proposed by California, Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Utah, West Virginia and the District of Columbia into the final Microsoft antitrust settlement. The current settlement has too many loop-holes. Here are the three points proposed by these states along with the reasons to incorporate them.

Require Microsoft to give computer makers more freedom to feature rival software on their machines. This is absolutely essential and obvious. Computer makers must have this freedom or Microsoft clearly has a monopoly.

Order Microsoft to sell a cheaper, stripped-down version of its Windows operating system. This is a superb requirement because it gives freedom of choice to everyone who uses Windows without stopping Microsoft from innovating. Otherwise Microsoft is forcing everyone to pay for Microsoft's application software programs when purchasing Windows, even if some people prefer non-Microsoft applications software programs.

Order Microsoft to do more to reveal the workings of Windows to competitors. This is absolutely essential. At present, Microsoft's application software programs can run better than their competitors software because Microsoft is not not telling their competitors about all the ways to hitch their software up to Windows.

As an example, part of Microsoft's defense is that

their Web Browser, Internet Explorer, is merged with Windows and it cannot be separated out. Actually only part of Internet Explorer is integral with Windows and Windows would function fine with other parts removed. Microsoft must disclose how to utilize the parts that could not be removed to competitors so that their Web Browsers can use them too or the competitor's web browsers don't have a chance of working as well as Microsoft's.

How does this make Microsoft's Internet Explorer web browser work better? Think about how long it takes to load a web browser. A competitor's web browsers can't possibly load as fast as Microsoft's because the whole browser must be loaded. Only part of Microsoft's browser needs to be loaded because the other part is integral to Windows. People get irritated if they have to wait too long for a browser to load and will end up using Microsoft's browser, even if they prefer other browsers for other reasons. Can't you see how Microsoft is using their Windows operating system, in this case, to leverage unfair competition?

These three requirements, proposed by a few states, are not vindictive and they address Microsoft's antitrust violations head on. They don't stop Microsoft from selling a version of Windows with integral applications software. People who prefer other applications software are not stuck with paying for Microsoft's. Microsoft has full freedom to innovate and so do their competitors. Computer makers have freedom of choice and so does every one who uses Windows.

Sincerely,

Rudy Stefenel

---

Do You Yahoo!?  
Great stuff seeking new owners in Yahoo! Auctions!  
<http://auctions.yahoo.com>